EXHIBIT 11

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 398-8 Filed 09/06/11 Page 2 of 2

From: Andy Rubin. Sent:4/13/2006 3:41 PM.
To: [-] Dan Bornstein. Cc: [-] Steve Horowitz.
Bcc: [-] . Subject: Re: What are we doing?.
Obvious question - please define:
"the currently-envisioned time frame"?
and "the currently-targeted amount"
On Apr 13, 2006, at 3:35 PM, Dan Bornstein wrote:
>> We need to provide an alternative to MSFT, and we need to do it in >> such a way as we don't fragment 3rd party developers. See the next
>> slide in the deck for fragmentation: Java has very little >> fragmentation, and it's adoptable. If we play our cards right, we
>> can also leverage not only existing developers, but applications as >> well.
> That sounds like an argument for adopting the MIDP model for third-party apps, not developing a new app model.
> Since we are Open Source, and the cost for our platform is close to
>> zero, we lower the total BOM by about 10%. That savings and some >> careful choices in hardware specs helped us create our slogan: >> "Smartphone features at featurephone prices".
>> STW, my definition of smartphone is a phone that has an open API for >> 3rd party developers and whose own applications use that same API.
> Ok, even conceding the point about BOM, I do not believe we can make a > smartphone by your definition in the currently-envisioned time frame,
> with the scope of development as currently outlined in the PRD, and > have it be one that can be good enough to sell the currently-targetted
> amount. In the current nominal plan, there is too much that is new to > expect everything to totally fall into place in a 1.0 release.
> Something still has to give. > >> I've cc'd android-team.
> I think you forgot to; please go ahead.
> dan